

# Rayleigh–Taylor problem for a liquid-liquid phase interface

By **XUEMEI CHEN AND ELIOT FRIED**

Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, Washington University in St. Louis,  
St. Louis, MO 63130-4899, USA

(Received 3 October 2005)

A linear stability analysis of the Rayleigh–Taylor problem for an incompressible fluid undergoing a liquid-liquid phase transformation is presented. Both inviscid and linearly viscous fluids are considered and interfacial tension is taken into account. Instability is possible only when the phase with the higher density is above that with the lower density. Study of the inviscid case shows that the exchange of mass between the phases decreases significantly both the range of unstable wave numbers and the maximum growth rate for unstable perturbations as compared to those arising classically. For a linearly viscous fluid, the shear and dilational viscosities of the interface are taken into account as are the migrational viscosities associated with the motion of the interface relative to the underlying fluid. When no mass exchange occurs between the phases in the base state and the interfacial viscosities are neglected, the growth rates exceed by at least an order of magnitude those for the classical Rayleigh–Taylor problem. The various interfacial viscosities slow the growth rates of disturbances but do not influence the range of unstable wave numbers. For both the inviscid and viscous cases, interfacial tension plays the same stabilizing role as it does classically.

---

## 1. Introduction

A single-component fluid may exist in more than one isotropic liquid phase (Angell 1995). A process in which one such phase grows at the expense of another is called “liquid-liquid phase transformation.” Although evidence of such transformations has emerged only relatively recently (Lee & Swendsen 2001), their importance in various chemical engineering processes is well-recognized (Tanaka 2000; Lee & Swendsen 2001; Rzehak, Müller-Krumbhaar & Marquardt 2003). An example of a process designed to take advantage of a transformation between two liquid phases is provided by heterogeneous azeotropic distillation (Widagdo & Seider 1996), where the transformation facilitates separation. Liquid-liquid phase transformations may also occur as undesired side-effects during vapor- or gas-liquid unit operation. Typical examples are provided by condensation (Burghardt & Bartelmus 1994), boiling heat transfer (Troniewski, Filipczak, Witczak & Trembacz 2001), mass transfer in falling film devices, and distillation in trays or packed columns (Siegert, Stichlmair, Repke & Wozny 2000). In these examples, liquid-liquid phase transformations may seriously undermine the efficiency of the intended operations (Rzehak, Müller-Krumbhaar & Marquardt 2003).

Despite the scientific and technological importance of liquid-liquid phase transformations, questions concerning the hydrodynamic stability of an interface separating the two liquid phases undergoing transformation do not appear to have been addressed prior to this work.

Hydrodynamic stability has been recognized as one of the central issues of fluid mechanics for more than a century. It has applications to engineering design, to meteorology and oceanography, and to astrophysics and geophysics. When a heavy fluid is superposed over a light fluid in a gravitational field and surface tension is neglected, the interface between the fluids is catastrophically unstable. Any perturbation of the interface tends to grow with time, producing the phenomenon known as Rayleigh–Taylor instability.

Rayleigh (1900) and Taylor (1950) considered the case of two incompressible fluids and predicted this instability by means of linear analysis that took into account the effects of inertial and body forces. The exponential growth rate determined by such treatment is proportional to  $\sqrt{k}$ , with  $k$  being the wave number of the perturbation. The experimental studies of Lewis (1950) showed that, for an liquid-air interface, this prediction was nearly correct during the initial phase of the instability. Linearized stability analyses were later extended to include the effects of surface tension, viscosity, and spatially nonuniform density distributions during the initial stage of the instability. Bellman & Pennington (1954) studied the effect of surface tension and found the cutoff wave number  $k_c$  below which perturbations are unstable to be

$$k_c = \sqrt{\frac{(\varrho^+ - \varrho^-)g}{\gamma}}, \quad (1.1)$$

where  $\varrho^+$  and  $\varrho^-$  denote the constant densities of the fluids above and below the interface,  $g$  is the magnitude of gravitational acceleration, and  $\gamma$  is the surface tension. When surface tension is neglected, the system is unstable whenever  $\varrho^+ > \varrho^-$ . However, when surface tension is taken into account, the system is linearly stable provided whenever  $k > k_c$ . Still when  $k$  is sufficiently small, or the wavelength is sufficiently long, the equilibrium system is unstable if the heavier fluid is on top of the lighter fluid. The cutoff wave number defined by (1.1) is unchanged when viscous effects are taken into account. In particular, Chandrasekhar (1955, 1961) provides an expression for the variation of the linear growth rate with both the Reynolds number  $Re$  and the Atwood number,

$$At = \frac{\varrho^+ - \varrho^-}{\varrho^+ + \varrho^-}, \quad (1.2)$$

both without and with surface tension.

So far, studies of interfacial instability have limited to the case where the interface separating the two fluids is a material surface. In this case, there is no transfer of mass across the interface. Thermal effects often play only a secondary role; therefore, the effect of heat transfer had also been neglected for the classical Rayleigh–Taylor problem. However, there are situations when the effect of mass or heat transfer across the interface are essential in determining the flow field. Hsieh (1977) presented a simple formulation to deal with interfacial instability problems involving mass and heat transfer. For an inviscid liquid–vapor system, he found that the effect of mass and heat transfer tend to enhance the stability of the system when the vapor is hotter than the liquid, although the classical stability criterion is still valid. Later authors such as Higuera (1987) studied the hydrodynamic stability of an evaporating liquid including the effect of fluid viscosities. He employed the classical Hertz–Knudsen–Langmuir equation (Hertz 1882; Knudsen 1915; Langmuir 1916) to connect the mass flux with the thermodynamic conditions at the interface. The destabilizing effects of the perturbations of gas pressure and vaporizing mass flux, previously pointed out by Plesset & Proeperetti (1982) in inviscid fluids, were recovered in a slightly more general setting, and their competition with the stabilizing effects of gravity and surface tension led to a stability limit.




FIGURE 1. Schematic of the (+) and (−) phases and the disturbed interface.

In parallel with research on hydrodynamic stability, an extensive literature has developed concerning the morphological stability of phase interfaces. The first work of this type, due to Mullins & Sekerka (1963), considers a spherical particle grown into a supersaturated solution and stability of the planar front during directional solidification of a binary liquid. In investigating the evolution of small perturbations of the interface, Mullins & Sekerka (1963) provided a rigorous basis of linear morphological instability at low solidification velocities. Trivedi & Kurz (1986) advanced the analysis of Mullins & Sekerka (1963) for the case of rapid solidification and developed stability criteria dependent upon the interfacial velocity. Following the analytical procedure of Trivedi & Kurz (1986), Galenko & Danilov (2004) extended the model by introducing the local nonequilibrium in the solute diffusion field around the interface. Using the developing local nonequilibrium model of solidification, they presented a self-consistent analysis of linear morphological stability with the attribution to the neutral and absolute morphological stability of a rapid moving interface. In liquid–solid systems, the most common supplemental constitutive relation to correlate solute concentration to the geometric properties of the interface is the Gibbs–Thomson equation (Volmer 1939).

The goal of this work is to extend the understanding of the Rayleigh–Taylor instability to account for transformation between the two liquid phases. This problem is of natural importance, just as it is for the liquid-vapor and liquid-solid phase transformations. Specifically, the behavior of a planar interface under one-dimensional infinitesimal sinusoidal disturbances is studied (Figure 1). The phases above and below the interface are denoted by (+) and (−), respectively. When a phase transformation occurs across the interface, the interfacial expressions for balance of mass, momentum and energy fail to provide a closed description and must be supplemented by an equation that accounts for the microphysics underlying the exchange of material between the phases. The Hertz–Knudsen–Langmuir and Gibbs–Thomson equations serve this role in sharp-interface models for liquid-vapor and liquid-solid phase transformations, respectively. The Gibbs–Thomson equation is typically derived using a variational argument which rules out the consideration of dissipative mechanisms. Gurtin & Struthers (1990) took a completely different point of view and used an argument based on invariance under observer changes to conclude that a configurational force momentum should join the standard force momentum as basic law of continuum physics. On this basis, Anderson, Cermelli, Fried, Gurtin & McFadden (2005) developed a complete set of equations governing the

evolution of a sharp interface separating two fluids undergoing transformation. In this paper, the bulk and interfacial evolution equations considered are the isothermal specialization of equations derived by Anderson, Cermelli, Fried, Gurtin & McFadden (2005). For the bulk phases, the evolution equations are standard and consist of the continuity equation

$$\operatorname{div} \mathbf{u} = 0 \quad (1.3)$$

and the linear momentum balance

$$\varrho \frac{D\mathbf{u}}{Dt} = -\operatorname{grad} p_e + \operatorname{div} \mathbf{S}, \quad (1.4)$$

where  $\varrho = \varrho^\pm$  is the constant density in the  $(\pm)$  phase,  $p_e$  is the effective pressure accounting for the potential of the gravitational body force density  $-\varrho \mathbf{g}$ , and the extra stress in the  $(\pm)$  phase is simply

$$\mathbf{S} = 2\mu^\pm \mathbf{D}, \quad (1.5)$$

where  $\mu = \mu^\pm$  is the (constant) viscosity the  $(\pm)$  phase and  $\mathbf{D} = \frac{1}{2}(\operatorname{grad} \mathbf{u} + (\operatorname{grad} \mathbf{u})^\top)$  is the rate-of-stretch. The interface conditions include the mass balance

$$[\![\varrho(V - \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{n})]\!] = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad J = \varrho^+(V - \mathbf{u}^+ \cdot \mathbf{n}) = \varrho^-(V - \mathbf{u}^- \cdot \mathbf{n}), \quad (1.6)$$

where  $[\![\varphi]\!] = \varphi^+ - \varphi^-$  denotes difference between the interfacial limits of a bulk field in the  $(+)$  and  $(-)$  phases,  $\mathbf{n}$  is the interfacial unit normal directed from the  $(-)$  phase into the  $(+)$  phase,  $V$  is the scalar normal velocity the interface in the direction of  $\mathbf{n}$ , and  $J$  is the mass flux normal to the interface, the linear momentum balance

$$[\![\mathbf{S}]\!]\mathbf{n} - [\![p_e]\!]\mathbf{n} - J^2[\![1/\varrho]\!]\mathbf{n} = -\gamma K \mathbf{n} - \operatorname{div}_s \{ \lambda(\operatorname{tr} \mathbb{D}) \mathbb{P} + 2\alpha \mathbb{D} \}, \quad (1.7)$$

where  $\gamma > 0$  is the (constant) interfacial tension,  $K$  is the total curvature (i.e., *twice* the mean curvature) of the interface,  $\mathbb{P} = \mathbf{1} - \mathbf{n} \otimes \mathbf{n}$  is the interfacial projector,  $\mathbb{D} = \mathbb{P} \langle \langle \mathbf{D} \rangle \rangle \mathbb{P}$  is the interfacial rate-of-stretch, and  $\lambda + \alpha > 0$  and  $\alpha > 0$  and are the (constant) dilational and shear viscosities of the interface, and the normal configurational momentum balance

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi - \mathbf{n} \cdot [\![\mathbf{S}/\varrho]\!]\mathbf{n} + [\![p_e/\varrho]\!] + \frac{1}{2}J^2[\![v^2]\!] \\ = \langle \langle 1/\varrho \rangle \rangle \{ \kappa V^{\operatorname{mig}} - \beta \Delta_s V^{\operatorname{mig}} + \lambda(\operatorname{tr} \mathbb{D})K + 2\alpha \mathbb{K} : \mathbb{D} \}, \end{aligned} \quad (1.8)$$

where  $\Psi$  is the (constant) specific free-energy of the  $(+)$  phase relative to that of the  $(-)$  phase,  $\langle \langle \varphi \rangle \rangle = \frac{1}{2}(\varphi^+ + \varphi^-)$  is the average of the interfacial limits of a bulk field  $\varphi$  in the  $(+)$  and  $(-)$  phases,  $V^{\operatorname{mig}} = V - \langle \langle \mathbf{u} \rangle \rangle \cdot \mathbf{n}$  is the migrational velocity of the interface,  $\mathbb{K}$  is the curvature tensor of the interface, and  $\kappa > 0$  and  $\beta > 0$  are the (constant) migrational viscosities of the interface. Whereas  $\kappa$  is related to the motion of the interface normal to itself,  $\beta$  is related to changes of the interfacial orientation. As noted by Anderson, Cermelli, Fried, Gurtin & McFadden (2005), the linear momentum balance (1.7) and the normal configurational momentum balance (1.8) combine to yield the relation

$$\Psi - [1/\varrho] \mathbf{n} \cdot \langle \langle \mathbf{S} \rangle \rangle \mathbf{n} + [v] \langle \langle p_e \rangle \rangle = -\langle \langle 1/\varrho \rangle \rangle \{ \gamma K - \kappa V^{\operatorname{mig}} + \operatorname{div}_s (\beta \operatorname{grad}_s V^{\operatorname{mig}}) \}, \quad (1.9)$$

which can be imposed in place of (1.8). Simplifying assumptions that reduce (1.9) to the Gibbs–Thomson equation are discussed by Anderson, Cermelli, Fried, Gurtin & McFadden (2005).

For a viscous fluid ( $\mu^+ \neq 0$  and  $\mu^- \neq 0$ ), the interface conditions (1.6)–(1.8) are supplemented by the kinematical condition

$$\mathbb{P}[\![\mathbf{u}]\!] = \mathbf{0}, \quad (1.10)$$

which enforces the requirement that the phases not slip with respect to one another.

The objective of this paper is to investigate the linear instability for an incompressible, Newtonian fluid undergoing a liquid-liquid phase transformation. The governing equations are linearized in the standard manner. For inviscid fluids, the interface conditions (1.6)–(1.8) are utilized to correlate the three disturbance amplitudes arising from the bulk equations (1.3) and (1.4) (with  $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{0}$ ). Similarly, when viscosity is taken into account, the supplemental no-slip condition (1.10) for the interface is used in addition to (1.6)–(1.8) to determine the five unknown disturbance amplitudes arising from the bulk equations (1.3) and (1.4). For inviscid fluids, we consider the influence of the initial mass flux across the interface on the growth of the disturbance. This effect is found to stabilize the disturbed system by moderating the propagation of the growth rate and decreasing the range of unstable wave numbers. For viscous fluids, we consider only the case where the base state does not involve mass transfer between the phases. In this case, the cutoff wave number is found to be identical to that of the classical Rayleigh–Taylor problem. Moreover, the disturbances are found to grow significantly faster than those of the classical Rayleigh–Taylor problem. The effects of the Reynolds number, Weber number, and Froude number on the growth rate of the disturbance are all considered. Also, the presence of the various interfacial viscosities  $\alpha$ ,  $\alpha + \lambda$ ,  $\kappa$ , and  $\beta$  leads to the consideration of three additional dimensionless quantities—the Boussinesq, Voronkov, and Gurtin numbers—all of which attenuate the growth of disturbances.

## 2. Base state

Using notation consistent with Figure 1, consider a stationary base state in which the  $(-)$  and  $(+)$  phases occupy the time-dependent regions  $\{\mathbf{x} : x_2 < V_0 t\}$  and  $\{\mathbf{x} : x_2 > V_0 t\}$ , respectively. The interface then corresponds to the time-dependent surface  $\{\mathbf{x} : x_2 = V_0 t\}$ . Suppose that the velocity and pressure in the base state are constant and given by  $\mathbf{u}_0^\pm = u_0 \mathbf{e}_1 + v_0^\pm \mathbf{e}_2$  and  $p_0^\pm$ . The bulk equations (1.3) and (1.4) then hold trivially. However, the interfacial equations (1.6), (1.7), and (1.8) require that the parameters  $v_0^\pm$ ,  $p_0^\pm$ , and  $V_0$  describing the base state be consistent with the equations

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \llbracket \varrho(V_0 - v_0) \rrbracket &= 0, \\ \llbracket p_e \rrbracket + J_0^2 \llbracket 1/\varrho \rrbracket &= 0, \\ \Psi + \llbracket p_e/\varrho \rrbracket + \frac{1}{2} J_0^2 \llbracket 1/\varrho^2 \rrbracket &= \langle\langle 1/\varrho \rangle\rangle \kappa(V_0 - \langle\langle v_0 \rangle\rangle), \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (2.1)$$

where

$$J_0 = \varrho^+(V_0 - v_0^+) = \varrho^-(V_0 - v_0^-) \quad (2.2)$$

denotes the mass flux across the interface in the base state.

When  $J_0 = 0$ , there is no mass transport between the phases in the base state. By (2.2),

$$v_0^+ = v_0^- = V_0 \quad (2.3)$$

and the fluid velocity is continuous in the base state. Moreover, (2.1)<sub>2,3</sub> reduce to

$$\llbracket p_e \rrbracket = 0, \quad \Psi + \llbracket p_e/\varrho \rrbracket = 0. \quad (2.4)$$

### 3. Inviscid case

We first consider the idealized case of a fluid that is inviscid in the sense that the bulk viscosities  $\mu^+$  and  $\mu^-$  as well as the interfacial viscosities  $\alpha$ ,  $\lambda$ ,  $\kappa$ , and  $\beta$  vanish. For such a fluid, the linear momentum balance (1.4) becomes

$$\varrho \frac{D\mathbf{u}}{Dt} = -\text{grad} p_e. \quad (3.1)$$

Further, the interfacial linear momentum balance (1.7) and the normal configurational momentum balance (1.8) become

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \llbracket p_e \rrbracket + J^2 \llbracket 1/\varrho \rrbracket &= \gamma K, \\ \Psi + \llbracket p_e/\varrho \rrbracket + \frac{1}{2} J^2 \llbracket v^2 \rrbracket &= 0. \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (3.2)$$

#### 3.1. Bulk disturbance

For an infinitesimal sinusoidal increment, indicated by the subscript 1, to the base state, the velocity and pressure in the  $(\pm)$  phase become  $\mathbf{u}^\pm = \mathbf{u}_0^\pm + \epsilon \mathbf{u}_1^\pm$  and  $p^\pm = p_0^\pm + \epsilon p_1^\pm$ , with  $\epsilon \ll 1$  and

$$(u_1^\pm, v_1^\pm, p_1^\pm)(x_1, x_2, t) = (u_1^\pm, v_1^\pm, p_1^\pm)(y) \exp \left\{ ikx + \frac{\omega t}{|\text{At}|T} \right\}, \quad (3.3)$$

where

$$x = \frac{x_1 - u_0 t}{L}, \quad y = \frac{x_2 - V_0 t}{L}, \quad (3.4)$$

$k > 0$  is the dimensionless wave-number of the perturbation,  $\omega$  is the dimensionless growth-rate of the perturbation, and  $L$  and  $T$  are characteristic length and time scales.

Inserting (3.3) into the continuity equation (1.3) and the momentum balance (3.1), neglecting terms of  $O(\epsilon^2)$ , and cancelling a common factor of  $\exp(ikx + \omega t/|\text{At}|T)$  from each term, we arrive at a system of three ordinary differential equations for each phase. On writing  $D = d/dy$ , that system takes the form

$$\left. \begin{aligned} iku_1^\pm + Dv_1^\pm &= 0, \\ \varrho^\pm \left\{ \frac{V_0 - v_0^\pm}{L} D - \frac{\omega}{|\text{At}|T} \right\} u_1^\pm &= \frac{ik}{L} p_1^\pm, \\ \varrho^\pm \left\{ \frac{V_0 - v_0^\pm}{L} D - \frac{\omega}{|\text{At}|T} \right\} v_1^\pm &= \frac{1}{L} Dp_1^\pm. \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (3.5)$$

Eliminating  $p_1^\pm$  and  $u_1^\pm$  from this system yields an ordinary differential equation,

$$(D^2 - k^2) \left\{ J_0 D - \frac{\varrho^\pm L \omega}{|\text{At}|T} \right\} v_1^\pm = 0, \quad (3.6)$$

for  $v_1^\pm$ . The characteristic roots of this equation are  $\pm k$  and, when  $J_0 \neq 0$ ,  $\varrho^\pm L \omega / J_0 |\text{At}|T$ . To rule out infinite fluid velocities in the far field, we exclude from consideration the last of these roots (which is of indeterminate sign) and take  $v_1$  to be of the form

$$v_1(y) = \begin{cases} A^+ \exp(-ky), & y > 0, \\ A^- \exp(ky), & y < 0, \end{cases} \quad (3.7)$$

with  $A^+$  and  $A^-$  being unknown amplitudes. In view of (3.7), the system (3.5) yields

expressions

$$u_1(y) = \begin{cases} -iA^+ \exp(-ky), & y > 0, \\ iA^- \exp(ky), & y < 0, \end{cases} \quad (3.8)$$

and

$$p_1(y) = \begin{cases} A^+ \left\{ J_0 + \frac{\varrho^+ L \omega}{|\text{At}| T k} \right\} \exp(-ky), & y > 0, \\ A^- \left\{ J_0 - \frac{\varrho^- L \omega}{|\text{At}| T k} \right\} \exp(ky), & y < 0, \end{cases} \quad (3.9)$$

for  $u_1$  and  $p_1$ .

### 3.2. Interfacial disturbance

We assume that the bulk disturbance is accompanied by an infinitesimal interfacial disturbance of the form  $x_2 = V_0 t + \epsilon F(x_1, t)$ . Direct calculations then show that

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \mathbf{n} &\sim -\epsilon \frac{\partial F}{\partial x_1} \mathbf{e}_1 + \mathbf{e}_2, & K &\sim \epsilon \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial x_1^2}, \\ V &\sim V_0 + \epsilon \frac{\partial F}{\partial t}, & J &\sim J_0 + \epsilon \varrho^\pm \left\{ \frac{\partial F}{\partial t} + u_0 \frac{\partial F}{\partial x_1} - v_1^\pm \right\}, \\ V^{\text{mig}} &\sim V_0^{\text{mig}} + \epsilon \left\{ \frac{\partial F}{\partial t} + u_0 \frac{\partial F}{\partial x_1} - \langle\langle v_1 \rangle\rangle \right\}. \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (3.10)$$

Consistent with the form (3.3) of the bulk disturbance, we take

$$F(x_1, t) = C \exp \left\{ ikx + \frac{\omega t}{|\text{At}| T} \right\}, \quad (3.11)$$

where  $x$  is as defined in (3.4)<sub>1</sub> and  $C$  is an additional unknown amplitude.

### 3.3. Amplitude equations

The bulk and interfacial disturbances involve three unknown amplitudes  $A^+$ ,  $A^-$ , and  $C$ . However, we have yet to make use of the interface conditions (1.6), (3.2)<sub>1</sub>, and (3.2)<sub>2</sub> expressing mass balance, linear momentum balance, and normal configurational momentum balance. Inserting the assumed forms for the velocity and the interface profile in the mass balance (1.6), using (3.7) and (3.8), and invoking the condition (2.1)<sub>1</sub> in the base state, dropping terms of  $O(\epsilon^2)$ , and cancelling a common factor of  $\exp(ikx + \omega t/|\text{At}|T)$  from each term, we obtain

$$\varrho^+ A^+ - \varrho^- A^- = \frac{2\langle\langle \varrho \rangle\rangle \omega}{T} C. \quad (3.12)$$

Proceeding similarly with the linear momentum balance (3.2)<sub>1</sub> and the normal configurational momentum balance (3.2)<sub>2</sub>, we obtain

$$\varrho^+ \left\{ \frac{J_0 k}{\varrho^-} + \frac{L \omega}{|\text{At}| T} \right\} A^+ - \varrho^- \left\{ \frac{J_0 k}{\varrho^+} - \frac{L \omega}{|\text{At}| T} \right\} A^- = \left\{ \langle\langle \varrho \rangle\rangle g - \frac{\gamma k^2}{L^2} + \frac{2J_0 \langle\langle \varrho \rangle\rangle \langle\langle \varrho \rangle\rangle \omega}{\varrho^+ \varrho^- |\text{At}| T} \right\} kC, \quad (3.13)$$

where  $g = |\mathbf{g}|$  denotes the magnitude of the gravitational acceleration, and

$$\left\{ \varrho^+ J_0 \langle 1/\varrho^2 \rangle k + \frac{L\omega}{|\text{At}|T} \right\} A^+ - \left\{ \varrho^- J_0 \langle 1/\varrho^2 \rangle k - \frac{L\omega}{|\text{At}|T} \right\} A^- = \frac{2\langle \varrho \rangle^2 \llbracket \varrho \rrbracket k\omega}{(\varrho^+ \varrho^-)^2 |\text{At}|T} C. \quad (3.14)$$

### 3.4. Dispersion relation

Equations (3.12)–(3.14) provide a homogeneous linear system for the disturbance amplitudes  $A^+$ ,  $A^-$ , and  $C$ . Had we imposed only mass balance and linear momentum balance on the interface, this system would be underdetermined. This underlines the need for an additional interface condition — provided here by the normal configurational momentum balance — to account for the microphysics of the phase transformation. Necessary and sufficient for the system (3.12)–(3.14) to yield a nontrivial solution is the requirement that its determinant vanish. This requirement yields the dispersion relation

$$\omega^2 + \left\{ \frac{\gamma k^2}{2\langle \varrho \rangle g L^2} - \text{At} \right\} \frac{g T^2 k}{L} + \frac{J_0^2 T^2 \text{At}^2 k^2}{\varrho^+ \varrho^- L^2} = 0. \quad (3.15)$$

Defining the Weber and Froude numbers via

$$\text{We} = \frac{\langle \varrho \rangle g L^2}{\gamma} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Fr} = \frac{L}{g T^2}, \quad (3.16)$$

and introducing the dimensionless interfacial mass flux

$$j = \frac{J_0 T}{\langle \varrho \rangle L}, \quad (3.17)$$

we may rewrite the dispersion relation (3.15) in the form

$$\omega^2 = \left\{ \text{At} - \frac{k^2}{2\text{We}} \right\} \frac{k}{\text{Fr}} - \frac{\text{At}^2 j^2 k^2}{1 - \text{At}^2}. \quad (3.18)$$

### 3.5. Analysis of the dispersion relation

#### 3.5.1. Base process without mass transport: $j = 0$

We consider first the case where the base state does not involve mass transport across the interface, so that  $j = 0$  and (3.18) reduces to

$$\omega^2 = \left\{ \text{At} - \frac{k^2}{2\text{We}} \right\} \frac{k}{\text{Fr}}. \quad (3.19)$$

From (3.19) it follows immediately that the base state is linearly unstable when  $\text{At} > 0$  and the wave number  $k$  obeys  $0 < k < k_c = \sqrt{2\text{AtWe}} = \sqrt{\langle \varrho \rangle g / \gamma L}$ . Bearing in mind that  $k$  is dimensionless, the cutoff wave number is equivalent to that derived by Bellman & Pennington (1954) for the classical Rayleigh–Taylor problem. When  $\text{At} < 0$ , so that the phase with the lower density is above that with the higher density, the growth rate  $\omega$  is pure imaginary and the system is neutrally stable. Hence, for an inviscid fluid and a base state with  $j = 0$ , the stability results are the same as those for the classical Rayleigh–Taylor problem.

#### 3.5.2. Base process with mass transport: $j \neq 0$

When  $j \neq 0$ , (3.18) includes a stabilizing term associated with the exchange of mass between the phases in the base state. This term influences both the range of unstable wave numbers and the magnitude of the growth rate when instability is present. In






FIGURE 2. Variation of the cutoff wave number  $k_c$  and the maximum growth rate  $\omega_m$  with the Atwood number  $At$ : on the left,  $k_c$ ; on the right,  $\omega_m$ . Combinations of  $k$  and  $At$  below the  $k_c$ -curve are unstable.

particular, an easy calculation shows that when  $j \neq 0$  the cutoff wave number  $k_c$  below which perturbations are unstable is given by

$$k_c = \sqrt{\left(\frac{WeFrAt^2j^2}{1-At^2}\right)^2 + 2AtWe} - \frac{WeFrAt^2j^2}{1-At^2}. \quad (3.20)$$

Since  $\sqrt{a^2+b} \leq a + \sqrt{b}$  for  $a > 0$  and  $b > 0$ , it follows that  $k_c$  as given by (3.20) is less than or equal to the cutoff wave number  $\sqrt{2AtWe}$  for classical Rayleigh–Taylor problem. Further, when  $j \neq 0$ , the maximum growth rate  $\omega_m$  is given by

$$\omega_m = \sqrt{\left(At - \frac{k_m^2}{2We}\right) \frac{k_m}{Fr} - \frac{At^2j^2k_m^2}{1-At^2}}, \quad (3.21)$$

where  $k_m$ , which is the most unstable wave number, is defined by

$$k_m = \frac{2}{3} \left\{ \sqrt{\left(\frac{WeFrAt^2j^2}{1-At^2}\right)^2 + \frac{3AtWe}{2}} - \frac{WeFrAt^2j^2}{1-At^2} \right\}. \quad (3.22)$$

Careful examination of (3.20) and (3.21) reveals that neither  $k_c$  nor  $\omega_m$  grows monotonically with the Atwood number  $At$ :  $k_c$  and  $\omega_m$  both vanish for the limit  $At \rightarrow 0$ , attain maxima at disparate values of  $At$  in the open interval  $(0, 1)$ , and vanish for the limit  $At \rightarrow 1$ . This behavior is illustrated in Figure 2 for  $We = 0.1$  and  $Fr = 1$ .

Again, since  $\sqrt{a^2+b} \leq a + \sqrt{b}$  for  $a > 0$  and  $b > 0$ , it follows from (3.22) that

$$k_m \leq \sqrt{\frac{2AtWe}{3}}. \quad (3.23)$$

Hence, the most unstable wave number for the problem involving a phase transformation is always less than or equal to its counterpart for the classical Rayleigh–Taylor problem. This behavior is illustrated in Figure 3 for  $We = 0.1$  and  $Fr = 1$ .

Plots of the growth rate  $\omega$  versus the wave number  $k$  for the Rayleigh–Taylor problem with a phase transformation (with  $j = 0.9$ ) and the classical Rayleigh–Taylor problem are provided, for  $We = 0.1$ ,  $Fr = 1$ , and various values of  $At$ , in Figure 4. Consistent with the foregoing discussion, these plots show little difference when  $At \ll 1$ . However, for relatively large  $At$ , the growth rate of any unstable mode is considerably depressed and the cutoff wave number below which perturbations are unstable is reduced.

Referring to (3.18), we observe that the growth rate increases with increasing Weber number  $We$  but decreases with increasing Froude number  $Fr$ .




FIGURE 3. Variation of the most unstable wave number  $k_m$  with the Atwood number  $At$ . Solid line: phase transformation. Dashed line: no phase transformation.




FIGURE 4. Comparison of the relation for the growth rate  $\omega$  versus the wave number  $k$  for various values of the Atwood number  $At$ : on the left,  $j = 0.9$ ; on the right, no phase transformation.

Also noteworthy is the observation that, even when interfacial tension is neglected, the mass transport term stabilizes the system when the disturbance wave number is above the cutoff wave number  $k_c = (1 - At^2)/4AtFrj^2$ . This stabilizing effect also vanishes when  $At \rightarrow 1$ .

Finally, because  $j$  appears in (3.18) only in terms of  $j^2$  the direction of the mass flow in the base state does not affect stability.

#### 4. Viscous case

We now study the influence of the various viscosities on the stability of the base state. For simplicity, we take the kinematic viscosities of the phases to be equal, so that

$$\frac{\mu^+}{\varrho^+} = \frac{\mu^-}{\varrho^-} = \nu. \quad (4.1)$$

As an additional simplifying assumption, we confine attention to base states that do not involve mass exchange between the phases. Thus,  $J_0 = 0$  and  $v_0^+ = v_0^- = V_0$ .

We consider bulk and interfacial disturbances identical to those imposed in the inviscid case. Proceeding as in the inviscid case, the continuity equation (1.3) and the momentum balance (1.4) yield (3.5)<sub>1</sub> and

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \varrho^\pm \left\{ \frac{\nu}{L^2} (D^2 - k^2) - \frac{\omega}{|At|T} \right\} u_1^\pm &= \frac{ik}{L} p_1^\pm, \\ \varrho^\pm \left\{ \frac{\nu}{L^2} (D^2 - k^2) - \frac{\omega}{|At|T} \right\} v_1^\pm &= \frac{1}{L} D p_1^\pm. \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (4.2)$$

Eliminating  $p_1^\pm$  and  $u_1^\pm$  from this system yields an ordinary differential equation,

$$(D^2 - k^2)(D^2 - q^2)v_1^\pm = 0, \quad \text{with} \quad q = \sqrt{k^2 + \frac{L^2\omega}{|\text{At}|T\nu}}, \quad (4.3)$$

for  $v_1^\pm$ . To rule out infinite fluid velocities in the far field, we choose  $v_1$  to be of the form

$$v_1(y) = \begin{cases} A^+ \exp(-ky) + B^+ \exp(-qy), & y > 0, \\ A^- \exp(ky) + B^- \exp(qy), & y < 0, \end{cases} \quad (4.4)$$

where  $A^\pm$  and  $B^\pm$  are unknown amplitudes. In view of (4.4), (3.5)<sub>1</sub> and (4.2) yield expressions

$$u_1(y) = \begin{cases} -iA^+ \exp(-ky) - \frac{iB^+q}{k} \exp(-qy), & y > 0, \\ iA^- \exp(ky) + \frac{iB^-q}{k} \exp(qy), & y < 0, \end{cases} \quad (4.5)$$

and

$$p_1(y) = \begin{cases} \frac{A^+ \varrho^+ L\omega}{|\text{At}|Tk} \exp(-ky), & y > 0, \\ -\frac{A^- \varrho^- L\omega}{|\text{At}|Tk} \exp(ky), & y < 0, \end{cases} \quad (4.6)$$

for  $v_1$  and  $p_1$ .

When viscosity is taken into account, the interface conditions (1.6), (1.7), and (1.8) imposing mass balance, linear momentum balance, and configurational momentum balance are supplemented by the no-slip condition (1.10) lead to a system of five equations connecting the unknown amplitudes  $A^+$ ,  $A^-$ ,  $B^+$ ,  $B^-$ , and  $C$  of the disturbance. Proceeding as in the inviscid case, but making use of the simplified base equations (2.4) instead of (2.1)<sub>2,3</sub>, we find that the mass balance (1.6) yields

$$\varrho^+(A^+ + B^+) - \varrho^-(A^- + B^-) = \frac{[\![\varrho]\!]\omega}{|\text{At}|T}C. \quad (4.7)$$

In contrast to the inviscid case, the linear momentum balance (1.7) now gives rise to nontrivial components in both the  $\mathbf{e}_1$  and the  $\mathbf{e}_2$  directions. In the  $\mathbf{e}_1$ -direction (1.7) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ 2\varrho^+k^2 + \frac{(\alpha + \frac{1}{2}\lambda)k^3}{\nu L} \right\} A^+ + \left\{ \varrho^+(k^2 + q^2) + \frac{(\alpha + \frac{1}{2}\lambda)k^2q}{\nu L} \right\} B^+ \\ & - \left\{ 2\varrho^-k^2 + \frac{(\alpha + \frac{1}{2}\lambda)k^3}{\nu L} \right\} A^- - \left\{ \varrho^-(k^2 + q^2) + \frac{(\alpha + \frac{1}{2}\lambda)k^2q}{\nu L} \right\} B^- = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

Importantly, (4.8) involves the combination  $\alpha + \frac{1}{2}\lambda$  of  $\alpha$  and  $\lambda$ . Since  $\alpha > 0$  and  $\alpha + \lambda > 0$ , it follows that  $\alpha + \frac{1}{2}\lambda = \frac{1}{2}\alpha + \frac{1}{2}(\alpha + \lambda) > 0$ . Hereafter, we refer to  $\alpha + \frac{1}{2}\lambda$  as the effective viscosity of the interface. Further, in the  $\mathbf{e}_2$ -direction (1.7) yields

$$\left\{ \frac{2\nu k^2}{L^2} + \frac{\omega}{|\text{At}|T} \right\} (\varrho^+ A^+ + \varrho^- A^-) + \frac{2\nu kq}{L^2} (\varrho^+ B^+ + \varrho^- B^-) = \frac{k}{L} \left\{ [\![\varrho]\!]g - \frac{\gamma k^2}{L^2} \right\} C. \quad (4.9)$$

Next, the normal configurational momentum balance yields (1.8)

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ \frac{2\nu k^2}{L^2} + \left( \kappa + \frac{\beta k^2}{L^2} \right) \frac{\langle\langle 1/\varrho \rangle\rangle k}{2L} + \frac{\omega}{|\text{At}|T} \right\} (A^+ + A^-) \\ & + \left\{ \frac{2\nu kq}{L^2} + \left( \kappa + \frac{\beta k^2}{L^2} \right) \frac{\langle\langle 1/\varrho \rangle\rangle k}{2L} \right\} (B^+ + B^-) = \left\{ \kappa + \frac{\beta k^2}{L^2} \right\} \frac{\langle\langle 1/\varrho \rangle\rangle k\omega}{|\text{At}|LT} C. \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

Finally, the no-slip condition (1.10) yields

$$kA^+ + qB^+ + kA^- + qB^- = 0. \quad (4.11)$$

The dispersion relation arising from the requirement that the determinant of the homogeneous system (4.7)–(4.8) vanish takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{2\omega^2 q}{|\text{At}|} \left\{ \omega^2 + \frac{4|\text{At}|k^2\omega}{\text{Re}} - \frac{4\text{At}^2 k^3(q-k)}{\text{Re}^2} + \left( \frac{k^2}{2\text{We}} - \text{At} \right) \frac{k}{\text{Fr}} \right\} \\ & + \frac{2\text{Bo}k^2 q\omega}{\text{Re}} \left\{ q\omega^2 + \left( \frac{k^2}{2\text{We}} - \text{At} \right) \frac{k(q-k)}{\text{Fr}} \right\} \\ & - k\omega \left\{ \frac{1}{\text{Vo}} + \frac{k^2}{\text{Gu}} \right\} \left\{ \left( k - \frac{q}{\text{At}^2} \right) \omega^2 - k(q-k) \left( \frac{4|\text{At}|k}{\text{Re}} \left( \omega + \frac{|\text{At}|k(q-k)}{\text{Re}} \right) - \frac{k^2}{2\text{WeFr}} - \frac{\text{At}}{\text{Fr}} \right) \right\} \\ & + \frac{\text{Bo}k^3(q-k)}{\text{Re}} \left\{ \frac{1}{\text{Vo}} + \frac{k^2}{\text{Gu}} \right\} \left\{ 2q\omega^3 + \left( \frac{k^2}{2\text{We}} - \text{At} \right) \frac{|\text{At}|k(q-k)}{\text{Fr}} \right\} = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (4.12)$$

where

$$\text{Re} = \frac{L^2}{\nu T}, \quad \text{Bo} = \frac{\lambda + 2\alpha}{2\langle\langle \varrho \rangle\rangle \nu L}, \quad \text{Vo} = \frac{L}{\langle\langle 1/\varrho \rangle\rangle \kappa T}, \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Gu} = \frac{L^3}{\langle\langle 1/\varrho \rangle\rangle \beta T} \quad (4.13)$$

are the Reynolds number, the Boussinesq number, the Voronkov number, and the Gurtin number.† We next explore the influence of the dimensionless parameters Re, Bo, Vo, and Gu associated with the viscosity of the liquid phases and the effective and migrational viscosities of the interface on the stability of the base process.

As in the inviscid case, we find it useful to make comparisons with results from the classical Rayleigh–Taylor problem. For this problem the normal configurational momentum balance is irrelevant and is replaced by the requirement  $V^{\text{mig}} = 0$  that the interface be material. When combined, the mass balance (1.6) and the condition  $V^{\text{mig}} = 0$  yield two interface conditions,  $V = \mathbf{u}^+ \cdot \mathbf{n}$  and  $V = \mathbf{u}^- \cdot \mathbf{n}$  to be imposed along with linear momentum balance (1.7) and the no-slip condition (1.10). Granted that the kinematical viscosities of the two fluids are identical, the relevant amplitude equations lead to the

† To the best of our knowledge, the migrational viscosity  $\kappa$  was first introduced by Voronkov (1964) in his extension of the Gibbs–Thomson relation to account for interfacial attachment kinetics. For that reason, we refer to the associated dimensionless number as the Voronkov number. The migrational viscosity  $\beta$ , associated with the change of orientation of the interface, was first introduced by Anderson, Cermelli, Fried, Gurtin & McFadden (2005). For this reason we refer to the associated dimensionless number as the Gurtin number.

dispersion relation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\omega}{|\text{At}|} \left\{ \left( 1 + \frac{(1 - \text{At}^2)q}{\text{At}^2(q - k)} \right) \omega^2 + \frac{4|\text{At}|k^2\omega}{\text{Re}} - \frac{4\text{At}^2k^3(q - k)}{\text{Re}^2} + \left( \frac{k^2}{2\text{We}} - \text{At} \right) \frac{k}{\text{Fr}} \right\} \\ + \frac{\text{Bo}k^2}{\text{Re}} \left\{ q\omega^2 + \left( \frac{k^2}{2\text{We}} - \text{At} \right) \frac{\text{At}^2k(q - k)}{\text{Fr}} \right\} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

#### 4.1. Influence of the kinematical viscosity

We now consider the influence of kinematical viscosity  $\nu$  of the phases while neglecting the influences of the effective viscosity  $\alpha + \frac{1}{2}\lambda$  and migrational viscosities  $\kappa$  and  $\beta$  of the interface. In this case,  $\text{Bo} = 0$ ,  $\text{Vo} \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\text{Gu} \rightarrow \infty$ , and the general dispersion relation (4.12) simplifies to

$$\omega^2 + \frac{4|\text{At}|k^2\omega}{\text{Re}} - \frac{4\text{At}^2k^3(q - k)}{\text{Re}^2} + \left\{ \frac{k^2}{2\text{We}} - \text{At} \right\} \frac{k}{\text{Fr}} = 0. \quad (4.15)$$

As one might expect, for  $\text{At}$  finite, setting  $\text{Re} \rightarrow \infty$  in (4.15) reduces (4.15) to the dispersion relation (3.19) obtained in the case of an inviscid fluid without mass transport in the base state. Another point of comparison is provided by the appropriate dispersion relation for the classical Rayleigh–Taylor problem. Specifically, when  $\text{Bo} = 0$ , (4.14) reduces to

$$\left\{ 1 + \frac{(1 - \text{At}^2)q}{\text{At}^2(q - k)} \right\} \omega^2 + \frac{4|\text{At}|k^2\omega}{\text{Re}} - \frac{4\text{At}^2k^3(q - k)}{\text{Re}^2} + \left\{ \frac{k^2}{2\text{We}} - \text{At} \right\} \frac{k}{\text{Fr}} = 0 \quad (4.16)$$

which differs from (4.15) only in the coefficient of  $\omega^2$ . In particular, upon setting  $\omega = 0$  in (4.15) and (4.16), we obtain an equivalent cutoff wave number  $k_c = \sqrt{2\text{AtWe}}$  below which perturbations are unstable. Hence, when the kinematic viscosities of the bulk phases are identical, mass transport is not present in the base state, and the effective and migrational viscosities of the interface, the range of unstable wave numbers for the Rayleigh–Taylor problem with a phase transformation is identical to the range of unstable wave numbers for the appropriate version of the classical Rayleigh–Taylor problem.

For  $\text{At} < 0$ , it is known that the system is stable for the classical Rayleigh–Taylor problem. We now show that this result also holds when a phase transformation occurs. Assume  $\text{At} < 0$  and  $\omega > 0$ . The final term on the left side of (4.15) must therefore be positive and the inequality

$$\omega^2 + \frac{4|\text{At}|k^2\omega}{\text{Re}} < \frac{4\text{At}^2k^3(q - k)}{\text{Re}^2} \quad (4.17)$$

must hold. Next, since

$$q = \sqrt{k^2 + \frac{\text{Re}\omega}{|\text{At}|}} = k\sqrt{1 + \frac{\text{Re}\omega}{|\text{At}|k^2}} < k\left\{ 1 + \frac{\text{Re}\omega}{2|\text{At}|k^2} \right\},$$

it follows from (4.17) that

$$\omega^2 + \frac{4|\text{At}|k^2\omega}{\text{Re}} < \frac{4\text{At}^2k^3(q - k)}{\text{Re}^2} < \frac{4\text{At}^2k^4}{\text{Re}^2} \frac{\omega\text{Re}}{2|\text{At}|k^2} = \frac{2|\text{At}|k^2\omega}{\text{Re}}$$

and, thus, that

$$\omega < -\frac{2|\text{At}|k^2}{\text{Re}} < 0.$$




FIGURE 5. Comparison of the relation for the growth rate  $\omega$  versus the wave number  $k$  for different Atwood numbers  $At$ : on the left, phase transformation; on the right, no phase transformation.

This last inequality contradicts the assumption that  $\omega$  be positive. Provided that  $At < 0$ , we therefore conclude that  $\omega$  must be negative as well.<sup>†</sup> Hence, when the kinematical viscosities of the bulk phases are identical, mass transport is not present in the base state, and the effective and migrational viscosities of the interface, instability is possible for the Rayleigh–Taylor problem with a phase transformation only when the phase with the higher density is above that with the lower density.

In view of the foregoing result, we observe that, when  $0 < At < 1$ , the coefficient of  $\omega^2$  in (4.16) is greater than that in (4.15). For equal values of the parameters  $0 < At < 1$ ,  $Re$ , and  $Fr$ , the magnitude of any unstable growth rate obtained from the dispersion relation (4.15) for the problem with a phase transformation will exceed that obtained from the dispersion relation (4.16) for the classical problem.

The parameters  $Re$ ,  $We$ , and  $Fr$  enter the dispersion relations (4.15) and (4.16) in an identical fashion. The influence of these parameters on stability should not differ for the problems with and without a phase transformation. Specifically, differentiating (4.15) with respect to  $Fr$ , we find that for  $0 < k < \sqrt{2AtWe}$ ,

$$2 \left\{ \omega + \frac{|At|k^2(2q - k)}{Re q} \right\} \frac{\partial \omega}{\partial Fr} = \left\{ \frac{k^2}{2We} - At \right\} \frac{k}{Fr^2} < 0.$$

Hence, the magnitude of the growth rate of the unstable wave modes decreases with increasing  $Fr$ . Similarly, differentiating (4.15) with respect to  $Re$  and  $We$ , we find  $\partial \omega / \partial Re > 0$  and  $\partial \omega / \partial We > 0$  for  $0 < k < \sqrt{2AtWe}$ . The growth of an unstable perturbation therefore increases for increasing  $Re$  and  $We$ .

Plots of the growth rate  $\omega$  versus the wave number  $k$  for  $Re = 1$ ,  $We = 0.1$ ,  $Fr = 1$ , and various values of  $At$  are provided in Figure 5. Consistent with analytical predictions, the cutoff wave numbers are indistinguishable and the growth rates for a phase interface are at least an order of magnitude greater than those for a material interface. Also, above the cutoff wave number the growth rates for the phase transformation and classical problems are pure imaginary and the base state is neutrally stable.

In contrast to the inviscid case, when the kinematic viscosity of the phases is taken into consideration the most unstable wave number  $k_m$  for the problem with a phase transformation is not necessarily less than or equal to its counterpart for the classical Rayleigh–Taylor problem. This behavior is illustrated in Figure 6, which shows a plot of  $k_m$  as a function of  $At$  for  $Re = 1$ ,  $We = 0.1$ , and  $Fr = 1$ . The behavior is complicated. Two solution branches exist for the classical problem. We plot only the combination of

<sup>†</sup> For  $At < 0$  and  $\omega$  complex with positive real part, an analogous, but algebraically more involved, argument also leads to a contradiction.




FIGURE 6. Variation of the most unstable wave number  $k_m$  with the Atwood number  $\text{At}$ . Solid line: phase transformation. Dashed line: no phase transformation.




FIGURE 7. Comparison of the relation for the growth rate  $\omega$  versus the wave number  $k$  for different Froude numbers  $\text{Fr}$ : on the left, phase transformation; on the right, no phase transformation.

those branches corresponding to the maximum value of the growth rate. The plot shows that  $k_m$  lies below its classical counterpart for  $\text{At}$  sufficiently close to 0 and 1; however, for intermediate values of  $\text{At}$ ,  $k_m$  lies above its classical counterpart.

The effect of varying the Froude number on the stability of the base state is illustrated in Figure 7, which shows plots of the growth rate  $\omega$  versus the wave number  $k$  for  $\text{At} = 0.05$ ,  $\text{Re} = 1$ ,  $\text{We} = 0.1$ , and various values of  $\text{Fr}$ . Consistent with analytical expectations, these plots show that the maximum growth rate decreases with increasing  $\text{Fr}$  whether or not a phase transformation occurs. Moreover, varying  $\text{Fr}$  does not affect the range of unstable wave numbers.

The impact of varying the Reynolds number is more complicated. For  $\text{At} = 0.5$ ,  $\text{We} = 0.1$ , and  $\text{Fr} = 1$ , Figure 8 shows that, for  $\text{Re} \leq 1$ , the system becomes more unstable as the Reynolds number is increased. This effect is manifested whether or not a phase transformation occurs but it is more notable for the classical Rayleigh–Taylor problem. For  $\text{Re} > 1$ , this effect is magnified: for the problem with a phase transformation, the maximum growth rate for phase transformation problem changes slightly from 0.04356 to 0.04387 when the Reynolds number changes from 1 to 100. Again, consistent with analytical expectations, the range of unstable wave numbers is not affected by  $\text{Re}$ .

Plots of the growth rate  $\omega$  versus the wave number  $k$  for  $\text{At} = 0.5$ ,  $\text{Fr} = 0.1$ ,  $\text{Re} = 1$ , and various values of  $\text{We}$  are shown in Figure 9. These plots show that the range of unstable modes and the maximum growth rate both decreases as  $\text{We}$  is decreased and, thus, exhibit the stabilizing influence of interfacial tension.

#### 4.2. Influence of the effective viscosity

Along with the kinematical viscosity  $\nu$  of the bulk phases, we now consider the influence of the effective viscosity  $\alpha + \frac{1}{2}\lambda$  of the interface on the stability of the base state. Inso




FIGURE 8. Comparison of the relation for the growth rate  $\omega$  versus the wave number  $k$  for different Reynolds numbers  $Re$ : on the left, phase transformation; on the right, no phase transformation.




FIGURE 9. Comparison of the relation for the growth rate  $\omega$  versus the wave number  $k$  for different Weber numbers  $We$ : on the left, phase transformation; on the right, no phase transformation.

doing, we neglect the migrational viscosities  $\alpha$  and  $\lambda$  of the interface. In this case  $Vo \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $Gu \rightarrow \infty$ , and the dispersion relation (4.12) becomes

$$\omega \left\{ \omega^2 + \frac{4|At|k^2\omega}{Re} - \frac{4At^2k^3(q-k)}{Re^2} + \frac{k}{Fr} \left( \frac{k^2}{2We} - At \right) \right\} + \frac{|At|Bo k^2}{Re} \left\{ q\omega^2 + \left( \frac{k^2}{2We} - At \right) \frac{k}{Fr} (q-k) \right\} = 0, \quad (4.18)$$

which should be compared with the dispersion relation (4.14) for classical Rayleigh–Taylor problem. Setting  $\omega = 0$  in both (4.18) and (4.14), we find that the cutoff wave number below which perturbations are unstable is identical for the problems with and without a phase transformation and again given by  $k_c = \sqrt{2AtWe}$ . Thus, accounting for the dilatational and shear viscosities of the interface does not influence the range of unstable wave numbers. Next, when  $At < 0$ , the terms associated with  $Bo$  are positive in both (4.18) and (4.14). Arguing as in the case when only the kinematical viscosities of the phases are taken into account, we therefore find that instability is possible only when the phase with the higher density is above that with the lower density.

For small  $At$ , the effect of varying  $Bo$  is not very significant. To make the effects of  $Bo$  discernible, we therefore choose a relatively large value of  $At$ . Specifically, for  $At = 0.5$ ,  $Re = 1$ ,  $We = 0.1$ ,  $Fr = 1$ , and various values of  $Bo$ , Figure 10 shows plots of the growth rate  $\omega$  versus the wave number  $k$ . Interestingly, these plots show that a phase interface is slightly more susceptible to the influence of the effective viscosity  $\alpha + \frac{1}{2}\lambda$ . Consistent with intuitive expectations, the role of effective viscosity is to dissipate the energy of the






FIGURE 10. Comparison of the relation for the growth rate  $\omega$  versus the wave number  $k$  for different Boussinesq number Bo: on the left, phase transformation; on the right, no phase transformation.




FIGURE 11. Comparison of the relation for the growth rate  $\omega$  versus the wave number  $k$  for different Vo and Gu: on the left, different Vo (Gu  $\rightarrow \infty$ ); on the right, different Gu (Vo  $\rightarrow \infty$ ).

disturbance and thereby decrease the magnitude of the growth rate corresponding to any unstable mode.

#### 4.3. Influence of the migrational viscosities

Along with the kinematical viscosity  $\nu$  of the bulk phases, we now consider the influence of the migrational viscosities  $\kappa$  and  $\beta$  of the interface on the stability of the base state. In so doing, we neglect the effective viscosity  $\alpha + \frac{1}{2}\lambda$  of the interface. In this case Bo = 0 and the dispersion relation (4.12) can be expressed as

$$\left\{ 2q + \left( \frac{1}{\text{Vo}} + \frac{k^2}{\text{Gu}} \right) k^2 (q - k) \right\} \left\{ \omega^2 + \frac{4|\text{At}|k^2\omega}{\text{Re}} - \frac{4\text{At}^2k^3(q - k)}{\text{Re}^2} + \left( \frac{k^2}{2\text{We}} - \text{At} \right) \frac{k}{\text{Fr}} \right\} + \left\{ \frac{1}{\text{Vo}} + \frac{k^2}{\text{Gu}} \right\} \frac{(1 - \text{At}^2)k^2q\omega^2}{\text{At}^2} = 0. \quad (4.19)$$

Setting  $\omega = 0$  in (4.19) shows, once again, that the cutoff wave number below which perturbations are unstable is  $k_c = \sqrt{2\text{AtWe}}$ . Also, since the second term on the right side of (4.19) is nonnegative and the remaining term involves the product of a nonnegative factor with the term appearing on the left side of the dispersion relation (4.15), we may conclude as before that instability is possible only when the phase with the higher density is above that with the lower density.

Plots of the growth rate  $\omega$  versus the wave number  $k$ , for At = 0.05, Re = 1, We = 0.1, Fr = 1, and various choices of Vo and Gu are provided in Figure 11. The plots confirm

that, like the shear and dilational viscosities, the migrational viscosities of the interface exert a stabilizing influence.

## 5. Summary

As is the case for the classical Rayleigh–Taylor problem, our analysis shows that a liquid-liquid phase interface is unstable only when the phase with the higher density is above that with the lower density. When the viscosities of the phases and the interface are neglected, we find that the presence of mass transport in the base state decreases the growth rate of any unstable perturbation. The Atwood number  $At$ , Weber number  $We$ , and the Froude number  $Fr$  play the same roles as they do for classical Rayleigh–Taylor problem. Specifically, larger  $At$  and  $We$  lead to more unstable system while increase in  $Fr$  tends to stabilize the system. In the viscous case, we assume that the kinematical viscosities of the phases are equal. We also neglect mass transport in the base state. When the various interfacial viscosities are neglected, we find that the growth rate of unstable modes increases with the Reynolds number  $Re$ . The Weber number  $We$  and Froude number  $Fr$  play the same roles for inviscid and viscous fluids. The range of unstable modes is insensitive to variations of these numbers. However, the growth rates of unstable modes increase and decrease, respectively, when  $We$  and  $Fr$  are increased. When the migrational viscosities of the interface are neglected but the dilational and shear viscosities of the interface are taken into account, we find that the associated Boussinesq number  $Bo$  does not affect the range of unstable modes but diminishes slightly the growth rate of unstable modes. When the dilatational viscosity of the interface is neglected but the migrational viscosities of the interface are taken into account, we find that the roles of the associated dimensionless parameters, the Voronkov number  $Vo$  and the Gurtin number,  $Gu$  are very similar to that of  $Bo$ . However, while they do not alter the interval of unstable modes, their impact on the growth rate is more significant.

We leave for a future work the question of how viscosity influences the stability of base states involving mass transport.

## Acknowledgment

This work was supported by the U. S. Department of Energy. We thank Bill Phillips and Oleg Chklyaev for very helpful discussions and suggestions.

## REFERENCES

- ANDERSON, D. M., CERMELLI, P., FRIED, E., GURTIN, M. E. & MCFADDEN, G. B. 2005 General dynamical sharp-interface conditions for phase transformations in heat-conducting fluids. *J. Fluid Mech.*, submitted.
- BELLMAN, R. & PENNINGTON, R. H. 1954 Effects of surface tension and viscosity on Taylor stability. *Q. Appl. Math.* **12**, 151–162.
- BURGHARDT, A. & BARTELMUS, G. 1994 Condensation of vapor mixtures forming two immiscible liquid phases. *Inz. Chemiczna Proces.* **15**, 327–351.
- CHANDRASEKHAR, S. 1955 The character of the equilibrium of an incompressible heavy viscous fluid of variable density. *Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* **51**, 162–178.
- CHANDRASEKHAR, S. 1961 *Hydrodynamic and Hydromagnetic Stability*. Dover, New York.
- DALY, B. J. 1967 Numerical study of two fluid Rayleigh–Taylor instability. *Phys. Fluids* **10**, 297–307.
- ANGELL, C. A. 1995 Formation of glasses from liquids and biopolymers. *Science* **267**, 1924–1935.
- DRAZIN, P. G., & REID, W. H. 2004 *Hydrodynamic Stability*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

- GALENKO, P. K. & DANILOV, D. A. 2004 Linear morphological stability analysis of the solid-liquid interface in rapid solidification of a binary system. *Phys. Rev. E* **69**, 051608.
- GURTIN, M. E. & STRUTHERS, A. 1990 Multiphase thermomechanics with interfacial structure 3. Evolving phase boundaries in the presence of bulk deformation. *Arch. Rational Mech. Analysis* **112**, 97–160.
- HERTZ, H. 1882 Ueber die Verdunstung der Flüssigkeiten, insbesondere des Quecksilbers, im luftleeren Raume. *Ann. Phys. (Leipzig)* **17**, 177–200.
- HIGUERA, F. J. 1987 The hydrodynamic stability of an evaporating liquid. *Phys. Fluids* **3**, 679–686.
- HSIEH, D. Y. 1978 Interfacial stability with mass and heat transfer. *Phys. Fluids* **21**, 745–748.
- KNUDSEN, H. 1915 Die Maximale Verdampfungsgeschwindigkeit des Quecksilbers. *Ann. Phys. (Leipzig)* **47**, 697–708.
- LANGMUIR, I. 1916 The evaporation, condensation and reflection of molecules and the mechanism of adsorption. *Phys. Rev.* **8**, 149–176.
- LEE, H. K. & SWENDSEN, R. H. 2001 Simple model of liquid-liquid phase transitions. *Phys. Rev. B* **64**, 214102.
- LEWIS, D. J. 1950 The instability of liquid surfaces when accelerated in a direction perpendicular to their planes. II *Proc. Roy. Soc. London A* **202**, 81–96.
- MULLINS, W. W. & SEKERKA, R. F. 1963 Morphological stability of a particle growing by diffusion or heat flow. *J. Appl. Phys.* **34**, 323–329.
- PLESSET, M. S. & PROPERETTI, A. 1982 Reply to commentents on “General analysis of stability of superposed fluids.” *Phys. Fluids* **25**, 911–912.
- RAYLEIGH, LORD 1900 Investigation of the character of the equilibrium of an incompressible heavy fluid of variable density. *Scientific Papers II*, 200.
- RZEHAK, R., MÜLLER-KRUMBHAAR, H. & MARQUARDT, W. 2003 Liquid-liquid phase transition in flow systems. *Chem. Eng. Sci.* **58**, 247–255.
- SIEGERT, M., STICHLMAIR, J., REPKE, J. U. & WOZNY, G. 2000 Heterogeneous azeotropic distillation in packed columns: Experimental results. *Chemical Engineering Technology* **23**, 1047–1050.
- TANAKA, H. 2000 General view of a liquid-liquid phase transition. *Physical Review E* **62**, 6968–6976.
- TAYLOR, G. I. 1950 The instability of liquid surfaces when accelerated in a direction perpendicular to their planes. *Proc. Roy. Soc. London A* **201**, 192–196.
- TRIVEDI, R. & KURZ, W. 1986 Morphological stability of a planar interface under rapid solidification conditions. *Acta Metall.* **34**, 1663–1670.
- TRONIEWSKI, L., FILIPCZAK, G., WITCZAK, W. & TREMBACZ, J. 2001 Boiling of immiscible liquid mixtures. *Inżyniera Chemiczna I Procesowa* **22**, 1411–1416.
- VOLMER, M. 1939 *Kinetik der Phasenbildung*. T. Steinkopff, Dresden.
- VORONKOV, V. V. 1964 Conditions for formation of mosaic structure on a crystallization front. *Sov. Phys. Solid State* **6**, 2378–2381.
- WIDAGDO, S. & SEIDER, W. D. 1996 Azeotropic distillation. *A.I.Ch.E. Journal* **42**, 96–130.



## List of Recent TAM Reports

No.	Authors	Title	Date
991	Christensen, K. T., and R. J. Adrian	Measurement of instantaneous Eulerian acceleration fields by particle-image accelerometry: Method and accuracy – <i>Experimental Fluids</i> (submitted)	Dec. 2001
992	Liu, M., and K. J. Hsia	Interfacial cracks between piezoelectric and elastic materials under in-plane electric loading – <i>Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids</i> <b>51</b> , 921–944 (2003)	Dec. 2001
993	Panat, R. P., S. Zhang, and K. J. Hsia	Bond coat surface rumpling in thermal barrier coatings – <i>Acta Materialia</i> <b>51</b> , 239–249 (2003)	Jan. 2002
994	Aref, H.	A transformation of the point vortex equations – <i>Physics of Fluids</i> <b>14</b> , 2395–2401 (2002)	Jan. 2002
995	Saif, M. T. A, S. Zhang, A. Haque, and K. J. Hsia	Effect of native $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$ on the elastic response of nanoscale aluminum films – <i>Acta Materialia</i> <b>50</b> , 2779–2786 (2002)	Jan. 2002
996	Fried, E., and M. E. Gurtin	A nonequilibrium theory of epitaxial growth that accounts for surface stress and surface diffusion – <i>Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids</i> <b>51</b> , 487–517 (2003)	Jan. 2002
997	Aref, H.	The development of chaotic advection – <i>Physics of Fluids</i> <b>14</b> , 1315–1325 (2002); see also <i>Virtual Journal of Nanoscale Science and Technology</i> , 11 March 2002	Jan. 2002
998	Christensen, K. T., and R. J. Adrian	The velocity and acceleration signatures of small-scale vortices in turbulent channel flow – <i>Journal of Turbulence</i> , in press (2002)	Jan. 2002
999	Riahi, D. N.	Flow instabilities in a horizontal dendrite layer rotating about an inclined axis – <i>Journal of Porous Media</i> , in press (2003)	Feb. 2002
1000	Kessler, M. R., and S. R. White	Cure kinetics of ring-opening metathesis polymerization of dicyclopentadiene – <i>Journal of Polymer Science A</i> <b>40</b> , 2373–2383 (2002)	Feb. 2002
1001	Dolbow, J. E., E. Fried, and A. Q. Shen	Point defects in nematic gels: The case for hedgehogs – <i>Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis</i> <b>177</b> , 21–51 (2005)	Feb. 2002
1002	Riahi, D. N.	Nonlinear steady convection in rotating mushy layers – <i>Journal of Fluid Mechanics</i> <b>485</b> , 279–306 (2003)	Mar. 2002
1003	Carlson, D. E., E. Fried, and S. Sellers	The totality of soft-states in a neo-classical nematic elastomer – <i>Journal of Elasticity</i> <b>69</b> , 169–180 (2003) with revised title	Mar. 2002
1004	Fried, E., and R. E. Todres	Normal-stress differences and the detection of disclinations in nematic elastomers – <i>Journal of Polymer Science B: Polymer Physics</i> <b>40</b> , 2098–2106 (2002)	June 2002
1005	Fried, E., and B. C. Roy	Gravity-induced segregation of cohesionless granular mixtures – <i>Lecture Notes in Mechanics</i> , in press (2002)	July 2002
1006	Tomkins, C. D., and R. J. Adrian	Spanwise structure and scale growth in turbulent boundary layers – <i>Journal of Fluid Mechanics</i> (submitted)	Aug. 2002
1007	Riahi, D. N.	On nonlinear convection in mushy layers: Part 2. Mixed oscillatory and stationary modes of convection – <i>Journal of Fluid Mechanics</i> <b>517</b> , 71–102 (2004)	Sept. 2002
1008	Aref, H., P. K. Newton, M. A. Stremler, T. Tokieda, and D. L. Vainchtein	Vortex crystals – <i>Advances in Applied Mathematics</i> <b>39</b> , in press (2002)	Oct. 2002
1009	Bagchi, P., and S. Balachandar	Effect of turbulence on the drag and lift of a particle – <i>Physics of Fluids</i> , in press (2003)	Oct. 2002
1010	Zhang, S., R. Panat, and K. J. Hsia	Influence of surface morphology on the adhesive strength of aluminum/epoxy interfaces – <i>Journal of Adhesion Science and Technology</i> <b>17</b> , 1685–1711 (2003)	Oct. 2002
1011	Carlson, D. E., E. Fried, and D. A. Tortorelli	On internal constraints in continuum mechanics – <i>Journal of Elasticity</i> <b>70</b> , 101–109 (2003)	Oct. 2002
1012	Boyland, P. L., M. A. Stremler, and H. Aref	Topological fluid mechanics of point vortex motions – <i>Physica D</i> <b>175</b> , 69–95 (2002)	Oct. 2002

### List of Recent TAM Reports (cont'd)

No.	Authors	Title	Date
1013	Bhattacharjee, P., and D. N. Riahi	Computational studies of the effect of rotation on convection during protein crystallization – <i>International Journal of Mathematical Sciences</i> , in press (2004)	Feb. 2003
1014	Brown, E. N., M. R. Kessler, N. R. Sottos, and S. R. White	<i>In situ</i> poly(urea-formaldehyde) microencapsulation of dicyclopentadiene – <i>Journal of Microencapsulation</i> (submitted)	Feb. 2003
1015	Brown, E. N., S. R. White, and N. R. Sottos	Microcapsule induced toughening in a self-healing polymer composite – <i>Journal of Materials Science</i> (submitted)	Feb. 2003
1016	Kuznetsov, I. R., and D. S. Stewart	Burning rate of energetic materials with thermal expansion – <i>Combustion and Flame</i> (submitted)	Mar. 2003
1017	Dolbow, J., E. Fried, and H. Ji	Chemically induced swelling of hydrogels – <i>Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids</i> , in press (2003)	Mar. 2003
1018	Costello, G. A.	Mechanics of wire rope – Mordica Lecture, Interwire 2003, Wire Association International, Atlanta, Georgia, May 12, 2003	Mar. 2003
1019	Wang, J., N. R. Sottos, and R. L. Weaver	Thin film adhesion measurement by laser induced stress waves – <i>Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids</i> (submitted)	Apr. 2003
1020	Bhattacharjee, P., and D. N. Riahi	Effect of rotation on surface tension driven flow during protein crystallization – <i>Microgravity Science and Technology</i> <b>14</b> , 36–44 (2003)	Apr. 2003
1021	Fried, E.	The configurational and standard force balances are not always statements of a single law – <i>Proceedings of the Royal Society</i> (submitted)	Apr. 2003
1022	Panat, R. P., and K. J. Hsia	Experimental investigation of the bond coat rumpling instability under isothermal and cyclic thermal histories in thermal barrier systems – <i>Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A</i> <b>460</b> , 1957–1979 (2003)	May 2003
1023	Fried, E., and M. E. Gurtin	A unified treatment of evolving interfaces accounting for small deformations and atomic transport: grain-boundaries, phase transitions, epitaxy – <i>Advances in Applied Mechanics</i> <b>40</b> , 1–177 (2004)	May 2003
1024	Dong, F., D. N. Riahi, and A. T. Hsui	On similarity waves in compacting media – <i>Horizons in World Physics</i> <b>244</b> , 45–82 (2004)	May 2003
1025	Liu, M., and K. J. Hsia	Locking of electric field induced non-180° domain switching and phase transition in ferroelectric materials upon cyclic electric fatigue – <i>Applied Physics Letters</i> <b>83</b> , 3978–3980 (2003)	May 2003
1026	Liu, M., K. J. Hsia, and M. Sardela Jr.	In situ X-ray diffraction study of electric field induced domain switching and phase transition in PZT-5H – <i>Journal of the American Ceramics Society</i> (submitted)	May 2003
1027	Riahi, D. N.	On flow of binary alloys during crystal growth – <i>Recent Research Development in Crystal Growth</i> , in press (2003)	May 2003
1028	Riahi, D. N.	On fluid dynamics during crystallization – <i>Recent Research Development in Fluid Dynamics</i> , in press (2003)	July 2003
1029	Fried, E., V. Korchagin, and R. E. Todres	Biaxial disclinated states in nematic elastomers – <i>Journal of Chemical Physics</i> <b>119</b> , 13170–13179 (2003)	July 2003
1030	Sharp, K. V., and R. J. Adrian	Transition from laminar to turbulent flow in liquid filled microtubes – <i>Physics of Fluids</i> (submitted)	July 2003
1031	Yoon, H. S., D. F. Hill, S. Balachandar, R. J. Adrian, and M. Y. Ha	Reynolds number scaling of flow in a Rushton turbine stirred tank: Part I – Mean flow, circular jet and tip vortex scaling – <i>Chemical Engineering Science</i> (submitted)	Aug. 2003
1032	Raju, R., S. Balachandar, D. F. Hill, and R. J. Adrian	Reynolds number scaling of flow in a Rushton turbine stirred tank: Part II – Eigen-decomposition of fluctuation – <i>Chemical Engineering Science</i> (submitted)	Aug. 2003
1033	Hill, K. M., G. Gioia, and V. V. Tota	Structure and kinematics in dense free-surface granular flow – <i>Physical Review Letters</i> <b>91</b> , 064302 (2003)	Aug. 2003

### List of Recent TAM Reports (cont'd)

No.	Authors	Title	Date
1034	Fried, E., and S. Sellers	Free-energy density functions for nematic elastomers— <i>Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids</i> <b>52</b> , 1671–1689 (2004)	Sept. 2003
1035	Kasimov, A. R., and D. S. Stewart	On the dynamics of self-sustained one-dimensional detonations: A numerical study in the shock-attached frame— <i>Physics of Fluids</i> (submitted)	Nov. 2003
1036	Fried, E., and B. C. Roy	Disclinations in a homogeneously deformed nematic elastomer— <i>Nature Materials</i> (submitted)	Nov. 2003
1037	Fried, E., and M. E. Gurtin	The unifying nature of the configurational force balance— <i>Mechanics of Material Forces</i> (P. Steinmann and G. A. Maugin, eds.), in press (2003)	Dec. 2003
1038	Panat, R., K. J. Hsia, and J. W. Oldham	Rumpling instability in thermal barrier systems under isothermal conditions in vacuum— <i>Philosophical Magazine</i> , in press (2004)	Dec. 2003
1039	Cermelli, P., E. Fried, and M. E. Gurtin	Sharp-interface nematic-isotropic phase transitions without flow— <i>Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis</i> <b>174</b> , 151–178 (2004)	Dec. 2003
1040	Yoo, S., and D. S. Stewart	A hybrid level-set method in two and three dimensions for modeling detonation and combustion problems in complex geometries— <i>Combustion Theory and Modeling</i> (submitted)	Feb. 2004
1041	Dienberg, C. E., S. E. Ott-Monsivais, J. L. Ranchero, A. A. Rzeszutko, and C. L. Winter	Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Research Conference in Mechanics (April 2003), TAM Department, UIUC (E. N. Brown, ed.)	Feb. 2004
1042	Kasimov, A. R., and D. S. Stewart	Asymptotic theory of ignition and failure of self-sustained detonations— <i>Journal of Fluid Mechanics</i> (submitted)	Feb. 2004
1043	Kasimov, A. R., and D. S. Stewart	Theory of direct initiation of gaseous detonations and comparison with experiment— <i>Proceedings of the Combustion Institute</i> (submitted)	Mar. 2004
1044	Panat, R., K. J. Hsia, and D. G. Cahill	Evolution of surface waviness in thin films via volume and surface diffusion— <i>Journal of Applied Physics</i> (submitted)	Mar. 2004
1045	Riahi, D. N.	Steady and oscillatory flow in a mushy layer— <i>Current Topics in Crystal Growth Research</i> , in press (2004)	Mar. 2004
1046	Riahi, D. N.	Modeling flows in protein crystal growth— <i>Current Topics in Crystal Growth Research</i> , in press (2004)	Mar. 2004
1047	Bagchi, P., and S. Balachandar	Response of the wake of an isolated particle to isotropic turbulent cross-flow— <i>Journal of Fluid Mechanics</i> (submitted)	Mar. 2004
1048	Brown, E. N., S. R. White, and N. R. Sottos	Fatigue crack propagation in microcapsule toughened epoxy— <i>Journal of Materials Science</i> (submitted)	Apr. 2004
1049	Zeng, L., S. Balachandar, and P. Fischer	Wall-induced forces on a rigid sphere at finite Reynolds number— <i>Journal of Fluid Mechanics</i> (submitted)	May 2004
1050	Dolbow, J., E. Fried, and H. Ji	A numerical strategy for investigating the kinetic response of stimulus-responsive hydrogels— <i>Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering</i> <b>194</b> , 4447–4480 (2005)	June 2004
1051	Riahi, D. N.	Effect of permeability on steady flow in a dendrite layer— <i>Journal of Porous Media</i> , in press (2004)	July 2004
1052	Cermelli, P., E. Fried, and M. E. Gurtin	Transport relations for surface integrals arising in the formulation of balance laws for evolving fluid interfaces— <i>Journal of Fluid Mechanics</i> (submitted)	Sept. 2004
1053	Stewart, D. S., and A. R. Kasimov	Theory of detonation with an embedded sonic locus— <i>SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics</i> (submitted)	Oct. 2004
1054	Stewart, D. S., K. C. Tang, S. Yoo, M. Q. Brewster, and I. R. Kuznetsov	Multi-scale modeling of solid rocket motors: Time integration methods from computational aerodynamics applied to stable quasi-steady motor burning— <i>Proceedings of the 43rd AIAA Aerospace Sciences Meeting and Exhibit</i> (January 2005), Paper AIAA-2005-0357 (2005)	Oct. 2004

### List of Recent TAM Reports (cont'd)

No.	Authors	Title	Date
1055	Ji, H., H. Mourad, E. Fried, and J. Dolbow	Kinetics of thermally induced swelling of hydrogels – <i>International Journal of Solids and Structures</i> (submitted)	Dec. 2004
1056	Fulton, J. M., S. Hussain, J. H. Lai, M. E. Ly, S. A. McGough, G. M. Miller, R. Oats, L. A. Shipton, P. K. Shreeman, D. S. Widrevitz, and E. A. Zimmermann	Final reports: Mechanics of complex materials, Summer 2004 (K. M. Hill and J. W. Phillips, eds.)	Dec. 2004
1057	Hill, K. M., G. Gioia, and D. R. Amaravadi	Radial segregation patterns in rotating granular mixtures: Waviness selection – <i>Physical Review Letters</i> <b>93</b> , 224301 (2004)	Dec. 2004
1058	Riahi, D. N.	Nonlinear oscillatory convection in rotating mushy layers – <i>Journal of Fluid Mechanics</i> (submitted)	Dec. 2004
1059	Okhuysen, B. S., and D. N. Riahi	On buoyant convection in binary solidification – <i>Journal of Fluid Mechanics</i> (submitted)	Jan. 2005
1060	Brown, E. N., S. R. White, and N. R. Sottos	Retardation and repair of fatigue cracks in a microcapsule toughened epoxy composite – Part I: Manual infiltration – <i>Composites Science and Technology</i> (submitted)	Jan. 2005
1061	Brown, E. N., S. R. White, and N. R. Sottos	Retardation and repair of fatigue cracks in a microcapsule toughened epoxy composite – Part II: <i>In situ</i> self-healing – <i>Composites Science and Technology</i> (submitted)	Jan. 2005
1062	Berfield, T. A., R. J. Ong, D. A. Payne, and N. R. Sottos	Residual stress effects on piezoelectric response of sol-gel derived PZT thin films – <i>Journal of Applied Physics</i> (submitted)	Apr. 2005
1063	Anderson, D. M., P. Cermelli, E. Fried, M. E. Gurtin, and G. B. McFadden	General dynamical sharp-interface conditions for phase transformations in viscous heat-conducting fluids – <i>Journal of Fluid Mechanics</i> (submitted)	Apr. 2005
1064	Fried, E., and M. E. Gurtin	Second-gradient fluids: A theory for incompressible flows at small length scales – <i>Journal of Fluid Mechanics</i> (submitted)	Apr. 2005
1065	Gioia, G., and F. A. Bombardelli	Localized turbulent flows on scouring granular beds – <i>Physical Review Letters</i> , in press (2005)	May 2005
1066	Fried, E., and S. Sellers	Orientational order and finite strain in nematic elastomers – <i>Journal of Chemical Physics</i> <b>123</b> , 044901 (2005)	May 2005
1067	Chen, Y.-C., and E. Fried	Uniaxial nematic elastomers: Constitutive framework and a simple application – <i>Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A</i> , in press (2005)	June 2005
1068	Fried, E., and S. Sellers	Incompatible strains associated with defects in nematic elastomers – <i>Physical Review Letters</i> (submitted)	Aug. 2005
1069	Gioia, G., and X. Dai	Surface stress and reversing size effect in the initial yielding of ultrathin films – <i>Journal of Applied Mechanics</i> , in press (2005)	Aug. 2005
1070	Gioia, G., and P. Chakraborty	Turbulent friction in rough pipes and the energy spectrum of the phenomenological theory – <i>arXiv:physics</i> 0507066 v1 8 Jul 2005	Aug. 2005
1071	Keller, M. W., and N. R. Sottos	Mechanical properties of capsules used in a self-healing polymer – <i>Experimental Mechanics</i> (submitted)	Sept. 2005
1072	Chakraborty, P., G. Gioia, and S. Kieffer	Volcán Reventador's unusual umbrella	Sept. 2005
1073	Fried, E., and S. Sellers	Soft elasticity is not necessary for striping in nematic elastomers – <i>Nature Physics</i> (submitted)	Sept. 2005
1074	Fried, E., M. E. Gurtin, and Amy Q. Shen	Theory for solvent, momentum, and energy transfer between a surfactant solution and a vapor atmosphere	Sept. 2005
1075	Chen, X., and E. Fried	Rayleigh-Taylor problem for a liquid-liquid phase interface – <i>Journal of Fluid Mechanics</i> (submitted)	Oct. 2005